

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS
Thoma Oil Co (Gelhar Car Service)
1024 Ohio Street, Oshkosh
54901-6451-24
03-71-000842

1. Is any drum containing soil cuttings/free product/contaminated water stored on the site and needs to be disposed of ?

It is my understanding that one partially filled drum of groundwater is left on site.

2. Were the removed tanks located at the existing tank location ?

The removed tanks were located west and immediately adjacent to the existing tanks.

3. Approximately 2000 gallons of gasoline were released. Is there any report regarding the management of the released product ?

There are no reports concerning the recovery of product. There are Oshkosh Fire Department reports that state that they "flooded the hole to float the tank and dilute the product". This release happened in 1974, one day after new tanks were installed. One of the tanks had been damaged during installation and subsequent to the release, was replaced.

4. Three recovery sumps were installed during excavation of soil as part of tank removal. Two out of three sumps are existing. How many tons of soil removed from the site ? How deep and how wide are the sumps ? Is the third sump abandoned ?

The report states that several tons of soil was removed from the site. There is no documentation to that effect. Unknown as to the construction of the sumps.

There is no documentation as to the abandonment of the third sump.

5. Where are new USTs located ?

North of MW-6. See reports.

6. The bid specification is for excavation around the pump island. Will the remedial action plan involve the removal or replacement of the existing pump island? and does the RP understand that these costs would not be PECFA eligible.

Given the very high levels of soil contamination in the area of the pump island and the continual increase in GW contaminant concentrations in the wells closest to the pump island, I believe it is in the best interest of PECFA and the RP to remove and excavate beneath the pump island. The RP is aware that it is not an eligible expense. I am working with the RP on this issue and anticipate it to happen, therefore I want that scope included in the bid.

7. Is a any remedial action necessary to address the high benzene concentrations in groundwater that seems to be originating from an area south of the tank basin?

I believe that contamination is mostly due to the 2,000-gallon release in 1974. The monitoring well in that area (MW-6) is demonstrating a decreasing trend in contaminant concentrations, therefore remedial action in that area does not appear to be warranted.

8. Bid Spec indicates minimum remedial requirements are to excavate approx. 500 yards around pump island to 10 ft. That is an active pump island so should we excavate a safe distance away from pump island or will COMM reimburse costs for shoring? Also, if groundwater accumulates in the excavation, can pumping it out during excavation count as one of the required sump pump events?

See question 7. Commerce will not pay for shoring. No, my experience with this area indicates that, unless there is rain, only a small amount of water will accumulate in the excavation.

9. Fischer's maps show "the area of excavation" around the tanks and dispensers. Was soil removed from this area? If so, how much?

All indications are that the outlined excavation was for tank removal and piping replacement. Only a small amount, if any, soil was removed from the site.

10. As of the August 1999 report, six USTs were "in use" at the Site. Do any of the UST systems remain on the Site? Have the dispensers been removed?

This is an active site with 3 remaining gasoline tanks, 1 fuel oil tank, and active dispensers. See questions 7 & 8.

11. What is the name of the bank for PECFA loan ?

This information is currently unknown, as no claim has been audited

12. Should the consultant be approved by the bank to participate in the bidding process and get the job after being successful ?

There is no Commerce requirement that consultants must be approved by a bank to participate in the bid process.

13. An existing consultant is an unsuccessful bidder due to non-compliance of the bid. The owner wants to retain the existing consultant in spite of non-compliance of the bid. Will the Department encourage to hire non-compliant bidders (previous consultants) ?

Commerce prefers that the responsible party hire the consulting firm that submitted the winning bid. However, Commerce does not encourage or discourage claimants from hiring a particular consultant.

14. An existing consultant is an unsuccessful bidder due to higher cost as compared to the cost of successful bidder. The owner wants to retain the

existing consultant. Will the Department promote this process ?

Commerce prefers that the responsible party hire the consulting firm that submitted the winning bid. However, at this time, the claimant can determine what PECFA-eligible consulting firm they will hire for the activities.

15. Will it be possible for the Department to send a copy of the tabulated results at the same time when the letter is sent to the successful bidder ?

The tabulated bid results will be posted on the internet shortly after the claimant is notified of the results.